

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 493

October 19, 1995, 4:40 p.m.
Page S-15324 Temp. Record

CUBAN LIBERTY ACT/Aid to Transitional Government

SUBJECT: Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1995 . . . H.R. 927. Graham motion to table en bloc the Dodd amendments Nos. 2906 and 2908 to the Helms substitute amendment No. 1936 to the Dole et al. substitute amendment No. 2898.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 64-34

SYNOPSIS: As introduced, H.R. 927, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1995, will strengthen sanctions against the communist Cuban government.

The Dole et al. substitute amendment would strengthen international sanctions against the Castro dictatorship in Cuba, develop a plan to support a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and enact provisions addressing the unauthorized use of property of United States citizens confiscated by the Castro dictatorship.

The Helms substitute amendment to the Dole substitute amendment would enact all the provisions of the Dole amendment except for the provisions addressing the unauthorized use of property of United States citizens confiscated by the Castro dictatorship.

The Dodd amendments Nos. 2906 and 2908 would strike the provisions that would set the basic requirements a post-Castro Cuban government would have to meet (the release of political prisoners, the legalization of political activity, the elimination of its secret police agency, the opening of its prisons to human rights inspections, and the scheduling of elections within 2 years) in order to be eligible to receive assistance from the United States.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Graham moved to table the Dodd amendments. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendments; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendments.

NOTE: The Dodd amendments were debated and voted on en bloc by unanimous consent.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

We have had intensive negotiations with the Administration on this bill. When we discussed the conditions on aid to a transitional

(See other side)

YEAS (64)			NAYS (34)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (50 or 94%)		Democrats (14 or 31%)	Republicans (3 or 6%)		Democrats (31 or 69%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Bradley	Chafee	Akaka	Johnston		Biden- ²
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Breaux	Hatfield	Baucus	Kennedy		
Bennett	Kassebaum	Bryan	Jeffords	Bingaman	Kerrey		
Bond	Kempthorne	Conrad		Boxer	Kohl		
Brown	Kyl	Dorgan		Bumpers	Leahy		
Burns	Lott	Ford		Byrd	Levin		
Campbell	Lugar	Graham		Daschle	Mikulski		
Coats	Mack	Hollings		Dodd	Moseley-Braun		
Cochran	McCain	Kerry		Exon	Moynihan		
Cohen	McConnell	Lautenberg		Feingold	Murray		
Coverdell	Murkowski	Lieberman		Feinstein	Nunn		
Craig	Nickles	Reid		Glenn	Pell		
D'Amato	Pressler	Robb		Harkin	Pryor		
DeWine	Roth	Rockefeller		Heflin	Sarbanes		
Dole	Santorum			Inouye	Simon		
Domenici	Shelby				Wellstone		
Faircloth	Simpson						
Frist	Smith						
Gorton	Snowe						
Gramm	Specter						
Grams	Stevens						
Grassley	Thomas						
Gregg	Thompson						
Hatch	Thurmond						
Helms	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

government, we were all in agreement that it would be helpful to know ahead of time the required conditions. In accordance with the Administration's wishes, the specific requirements are pretty basic: political activity must be legalized, elections must be scheduled, the secret police must be disbanded, and political prisoners must be released. If our colleagues think we should give aid to a transitional government if it does not take these steps we will be interested to hear it. In addition to these requirements, the bill also lists factors that the President should consider in deciding if a post-Castro government is sufficiently moving toward democracy to warrant giving it assistance. For instance, the bill asks the President to consider whether the post-Castro government protects human rights. Again, if our colleagues think any of the particular items listed should not be considered, we will be happy to listen to their objections.

Some Senators have suggested that it is unprecedented to attach conditions on aid to a government that does not yet exist in anticipation of that government coming to power. Perhaps so, but that is nothing about which to brag. The United States should not conduct its foreign policy by reflexively responding to world events. The leader of the free world should lead by anticipating changes and preparing for changes. This bill will result in the United States carefully planning out ahead of time how it will help Cuba on the road to freedom.

Our colleagues' amendments are misguided. If Senators think we should refuse to think out beforehand how to respond helpfully to changes that are likely to occur soon in Cuba, then they should vote in favor of the Dodd amendments. If they agree with us, and in this case even the Clinton Administration, that it is better to prepare ahead of time, they will vote to table them.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The restrictions that would be stricken by the Dodd amendments would unduly hamper the ability of this country to provide assistance to a post-Castro government. These restrictions go on for page after page, saying precisely the conditions that a post-Castro government must meet, and the conditions that it should meet, in order to receive aid. These restrictions are really rather severe. Had similar conditions been placed on aid to the nations of the former Soviet Union or to the nations of Eastern Europe when they first escaped communism aid could not have been given. Without aid, those countries could have easily slipped back into totalitarianism. The United States has never before applied restrictions on aid to a government before it even existed, and it should not start now. Therefore, we urge our colleagues to support the Dodd amendments, which would strike these ill-considered restrictions from the bill.